DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 084 FL 018 439

AUTHOR Zdenek, Joseph W.
TITLE Assessment of Foreign Language Majors: An Alternative to the ACTFL Proficiency Tests.
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Mountain Interstate Foreign Language Conference (38th, Knoxville, TN, October 6-8, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cost Effectiveness; Higher Education; *Language Proficiency; *Language Tests; *Majors (Students); Second Language Learning; *Test Selection
IDENTIFIERS *ACTFL ETS Language Proficiency Guidelines; Winthrop College SC

ABSTRACT

While the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages' (ACTFL) proficiency guidelines have many proponents, critics find testing according to the guidelines costly and time-consuming. Winthrop College (South Carolina) has developed an approach to testing foreign language majors that tests all skill areas, can be administered using no teacher time, and produces raw and percentile scores and a wider range of score results than the ACTFL test. Initially considered essentially diagnostic, used early in the program to allow for remedial work, the test was later approved as a screening measure for students planning to student teach and subsequently as a graduation requirement for all French and Spanish majors. Advantages of the test include the broad scoring range and the use of familiar and readily interpreted percentiles. The measure includes reading, writing, and oral components. Knowledge of culture and literature are not assessed. The oral test portion incorporates five skill categories (comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and accent). A weighted evaluation option is also provided for students who have significant difficulty with one question. The test is seen as useful in assessing both student progress and program effectiveness. The catalog description, norms, and some test forms are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED317084

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Zdenek
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Assessment of Foreign Language Majors: An Alternative to the ACTFL Proficiency Tests

Joseph W. Zdenek

For several years the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines have been promoted as the best means of measuring language proficiency in all skills (speaking, reading, writing, listening) and cultural awareness. Most of the emphasis has been on the oral component, because proficiency for most people is equated to speaking the language. Workshops have been given, videotapes have been prepared, examiners have been trained. Tester workshops are scheduled throughout the nation by ACTFL, and indeed, there are frequently pre-conference oral proficiency interview tester workshops at conferences every year.

Now curricula are being redesigned and textbooks are appearing whose authors claim their presentation of material is based on proficiency guidelines. Proficiency testing/proficiency teaching have become new bandwagon terms or slogans in FL like communicative competence, individualized instruction, and career oriented curricula before. The proponents are many, and now the critics are also becoming more and more vociferous. Savignon, Frawley, Lantolf, and Schulz, among others, have all spoken and written about the dangers of upsetting the FL applecart, orienting all our efforts toward teaching for proficiency, casting aside all the other improvements and advances in FL pedagogy, neglecting the other benefits of FL study, and ignoring research or setting the system in motion without a good research base.

Many foreign language instructors find it difficult to use the proficiency guidelines for testing, especially the speaking skill, because of the training required to be able to administer the test. It is time consuming and can be fairly expensive (nearly $500 for the training itself) and

FL018439

2 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

therefore it is difficult for every member of a college or university faculty to be trained. In our department, for example, we have only one person who began his training as a tester in Spanish. Unfortunately, he never finished his training because he did not have enough students on campus and in the area to offer a broad enough spectrum to serve as his examples. Some of the other faculty members are not interested in being trained as testers. Indeed, I am sure some don't know anything about the concept. If there are some who want to be trained, there is the problem of allocating $500 plus travel expenses per individual from an already tight budget.

A second drawback to proficiency testing is the amount of time required to test the students themselves. Even on a college campus, oral proficiency testing is a scheduling nightmare.

To be discussed in this presentation is a viable alternative approach to the ACTFL proficiency testing which costs much less in time and money, and which has been successful for over ten years at Winthrop College, a state supported four-year college in Rock Hill, S.C., with a student body of approximately 5000.

Our test covers all skills. Most of it can be administered with no teacher time involved. We have raw and percentile scores and a wider range of score results than on the ACTFL test.

The idea of some sort of competency or proficiency exam (I use the terms interchangeably here and do not try to distinguish between the denotations suggested by Rivers, Chomsky and others) was hatched over ten years ago by a colleague of mine in French and myself because we were concerned that some students could take x number of courses, pass them with various levels of success, but in their senior year really were quite disappointing to us in their total global command of target language skills. Some could communicate

quite well; others would have difficulty not starving in Paris or Madrid. Some could read and understand any text; others could read but not understand; others, unfortunately, could do neither. In sum, our end product which we were labeling a Spanish major or a French major was uneven or ragged. There was no guarantee of an end product with an acceptable degree of competence in target language skills. Therefore we drew up a plan that was later approved by the entire department. We decided, instead of reinventing the wheel, so to speak, by working up our own tests, to use some already designed by test committees, tried out and validated by hundreds of schools and teachers and thousands of students. We had for years at Winthrop used for voluntary placement purposes the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests. When the institution changed to the CLEP exams we had on hand many copies of the LA, MA and MB versions of these exams, and therefore we decided to use them. We had grading procedures and norms available for two, three and four years of high school level language as well as first and second year college levels. After examining the test we decided to accept as a minimum score the mid 60th percentile band of the most difficult exam for which scores are available, the fourth year high school <u>general</u> norm, not the audio lingual norm, since no one was really teaching the pure audio lingual method anymore. We decided we wanted to measure the competencies of students who came to us with zero to several years of language experience in high school and then took 20 or so additional semester hours of that language at the college level. These were the highest sets of norms available to us, but the minimal score (mid 60th percentile band) was arbitrary. We have discussed raising it and even lowering it, but decided the 60th percentile was fair and could be easily understood by our students.

We consulted with a colleague in the math department about percentile bands. Since students whose scores, raw or converted, fall into overlapping percentile bands are considered to have no significant difference in levels of achievement (note here the word achievement is used since the MLA exams are called achievement exams rather than competency or proficiency exams) we decided it was the safest interpretation to take the lowest raw or converted score which corresponded to the lowest percentile band containing the mid 60th percentile score. In this way no one (student or parent) could claim an unfairness of interpretation of a certain arbitrarily chosen raw score as passing. After all, in some cases one answer could determine the percentile band. A lower score, however, would clearly place a student in a lower band missing the 60th percentile completely. Nevertheless, we thought this was the only fair way to do it. (See attachment of percentile ranges.) Thus the passing score on the French MA reading test is 26, on the writing test 51, on the Spanish MA reading test 22, on the writing test 54. Thus we arrived at the scores for the reading and writing portions. As far as the listening and speaking portions of the exams, we decided on an oral interview format with 10 or 15 questions. For years in many classes we evaluated student responses according to three categories (pronunciation, fluency and accuracy) with a scale from 0 to 3. (See attachment of test.) We expected 60% passing on this test also, although here we are clearly referring to a percentage rather than to a percentile. The MLA sections of the test take 35 minutes each, the oral interview approximately 15 minutes. The latter can be taken independently from the other sections. Therefore actual teacher time was that required for the oral section only, about 15 minutes.

Our test was later approved by CCTEP (Coordinating Committee for Teacher Education Programs) as a screening measure for students planning to student

teach. None is allowed to begin the student teaching or internship without having passed the exam.

Students were identified by their undergraduate advisors as being ready for the test according to the guidelines established by the department. Advisors identified majors who had completed 20 to 24 hours of the language including advanced grammar and a reading course. A letter was sent to each of the students from my office explaining the test and asking the student to set up an appointment for the whole test or part of it. (See attachment of letter.)

A caveat for departments - we did not include a statement about this test requirement in the catalog until a few years ago when two poor but vociferous students claimed it was not listed in the catalog and therefore not part of the requirements, although we thought we had our bases covered since it was mentioned on the handout presented to all students who indicated they planned to major in modern languages. One student took the exam and failed all parts, but graduated anyway, simply because she fulfilled the graduation requirements of 122 hours with a 2.00 GPR. Fortunately, she, until recently, was a clerk in a bookstore and didn't use her meager knowledge of French. The second refused to take the exam but was persuaded to claim her second major in order to graduate. She hopefully is not using her French anywhere, either. As a result of these student problems after nearly ten years of administering the test, a statement was added to the catalog so that none could claim ignorance.

Up to this year we had conceived of this exam as a purely diagnostic one, one that would point out student strengths and weaknesses, one that our majors would view as a guide to eventual success, and not as a requirement for graduation. We wanted our majors to do well and recommended remediation if

they didn't to help them achieve success. If a student did not pass, he/she could graduate anyway, although we made it clear we could not in all good conscience write a letter of recommendation for that student. This threat spurred some on to try again; others, however, never ask for letters of recommendation, as you know.

Also, in the last few years we have sensed a deterioration in the quality of our incoming freshmen and poorer quality work among our majors. More students have been doing poorly on the exam than in the past. Therefore, following a precedent set by the art department which established a senior review of each student's portfolio as a requirement for graduation, we have changed our once purely diagnostic exam into one required for graduation. Students register for the test as they do for a course, but take it without credit and on an S/U basis. (See attachment of catalog description of major.) The exam is administered at approximately the same stage of development of language skills, although we are more specific here than in the past: students register for the test after completing 18 hours beyond the 102 level. This means they will have probably completed some advanced work in grammar and a course with a heavy reading component. We have built into our requirement some additional specifications: the test is to be taken no later than the second semester of the junior year so as to allow ample time for remediation and a student must pass the course before being allowed to take any course on the 500 level. This will guarantee greater homogeneity of student ability in our 500 level courses.

A concomitant curricular change that occurred was the establishment of SPA/FRE 250, Introduction to Literature. For years we have felt that there is a tremendous jump students must make from skills courses to reading courses such as surveys of literature. We were frequently faced by students who could

not read with any speed or comprehension and who knew nothing of literary terms or movements. Therefore, we felt a need to establish a transitional course called Introduction to Literature to cut down on professors' ulcers.

Another change was necessary. Since the test I've described now affects graduation, we test all majors, as well as any minors and others interested, after the intermediate level for diagnostic purposes. At this time we can point to certain problem areas, make specific recommendations to the student and even, if necessary, suggest a career choice change. After a student has completed all three courses on the intermediate level he/she will be tested, using the level LA of the MLA tests. Our intermediate level consists of three courses, all of which are required for majors and minors: 201, 202 and 250, described earlier. 201 is normally the first course students enter if they have had 2 or 3 years of good language training in high school; it is also the first course that counts toward the major. It is a one semester, comprehensive, multi-skill course. 202 is intermediate conversation; it is not a continuation of 201 but a complement to it; it can be taken, in certain circumstances before 201 or at the same time. Therefore, after completion of these three courses, in whatever order, the advisor will indicate to me that student x has completed the intermediate level, and I will send a letter informing the student of the need to be tested.

One of the advantages of using our exam is that we have a wider range of scores than is possible on the ACTFL proficiency exams. Most students after three or four years of college work will score 1+ or 2; some rare individuals will score a 2+, the score Archie Bunker would get in his native language. This is a narrow band into which most students fall. On our exam we have had a range between the 7th percentile and the 98th percentile on the reading portion, a similar range on the writing portion and a range between 50% and

100% on the speaking portion. We can really see how our kids stack up against each other. Also the scores are more meaningful to the students who are quite accustomed to percentages and percentiles.

A comment about the oral interview. In most cases native speakers are exempt from taking this portion. I earlier mentioned that several students had achieved 100%. In our original scale, 3 was the highest score to be earned; 3 does not mean perfection but rather the highest score possible at a particular level, with very minor grammatical errors that in no way inhibit communication. On our new scale, used for the first time last year, likewise a 5 does not mean perfection. After all, no one is perfect; Henry Kissinger is a 4+ on the ILS scale, not a 5. (See attachment of the new scale.) On this scale we have increased the range from 0-3 to 1-5. This allows for more range and 3 represents for most people a kind of middle. Also we are looking at five categories (comprehension, grammar, vocabulary, fluency and accent) rather than three (pronunciation, fluency and accuracy). As a guide to the tester and to the testee we have descriptors for each numerical value. In the south some students have particular speech habits we do not want to see carried over to Spanish or French; thus the descriptors you see are relevant to our student body. You would need to design your own descriptors to fit your needs. The score sheet is filled in by the tester, totaled and divided by 250 for a percentage score. (See attachment of a list of percentage scores based on raw scores.) A word about the weighted evaluation. In some cases, to give a student an extra boost or a chance to make up for a question on which he really bombed out, there is the option of asking an additional question worth up to 10 points. These points are added to the total and the total is then divided by 250; this is the weighted evaluation. The scores of the testers are averaged together to arrive at the student's percentage score.

Usually two professors are present and alternately ask questions. Sometimes the interview is taped for further study, to come to a consensus on a certain score if there is quite a difference between the scores recorded and to note what kinds of errors are made.

After the reading and writing portions of the test are graded according to the grading procedures established for the MLA tests, and the oral portion is graded according to the grading procedure just described, I hold a personal interview with each student. Without showing the student the answers, I explain the concepts of proficiency or competence versus achievement, I point out areas of deficiencies (weak grasp of the subjunctive, no discrimination between the r and the rr, uncertainty about using the preterite or the imperfect, confusion between the indirect and the direct object pronouns, lack of agreement of the past participle with the preceding direct object pronoun, tendency to think in English and translate into the target language, etc.). For those students who do not pass, remediation is recommended: repeating a course, studying certain sections of a basic or advanced grammar text, computer drills, completing exercises on certain grammar points in a workbook or working with an instructor who is willing to help the student. Alternately we administer the same test or the MB version of it which has different minimal percentile band requirements. Students are asked to restudy for the parts failed and retake only that portion. A problem we have not addressed is how many times we will allow students to retest. We once had a very determined student who took the test five times and finally passed. It seems to me that three times should be the maximum as it is for the EEE in S.C.

Other areas, knowledge of culture and literature, are not assessed via the exam I have just described. This is a concern of several members of the department and is currently under discussion.

What about our successes or lacks of success? Most students pass all three parts. After all, we are talking about minimal competences here. Occasionally a student will fail one section, usually the reading one, and have to take this section over. Some students drop out of the program and switch majors; several have transferred to other schools that do not have such an exam. Our new system has teeth in it:

(1) students must receive passing scores in order to enter the FL methods course in the Teacher Education Program;

(2) Students must pass in order to graduate as a French or Spanish major.

Our whole testing plan as described here, i.e. early testing, remediation, guidance, final testing, with additional remediation if necessary, is consonant with what education should be about.

The testing program I have described here identifies for us weaknesses in our students, weaknesses perhaps in our program, which we need to address, points the way to success and guarantees an end product we can be proud to label a Winthrop College French or Spanish major.

J. W. Zdenek
Chair, Modern & Classical Languages
Winthrop College
Kinard Building
Rock Hill, SC 29733

Modern Languages

Faculty 1987-88

Professors
Guillermo I. Castillo
Frances B. Exum
Dorothy H. Medlin
Joseph W. Zdenek

Associate Professor
J. Donald Horst

Assistant Professors
Judith L. Barban
Spencer C. Deyton
Thomas A. Shealy

Instructor
John G. Golden

Lecturers
Linda N. Crossland
Michele L. Fouquet
Yan Ke

Bachelor of Arts in Modern Languages

The Department of Modern and Classical Languages offers a B.A. in Modern Languages with two specializations, Spanish and French.

Students majoring in foreign language have gone on to graduate school in advanced language study or international business, have entered the teaching profession, or have obtained positions in translation services and bilingual capacities in business and industry and in travel agencies.

The beginning courses (101-102), or the equivalent, are prerequisites for all other courses; however they may not be applied toward fulfillment of the required program in any language. They will be applied as part of the 41 hours of elective credit available.

Required Program:	Semester Hours
Either SPA or FRE 201, 202, 250, 401, 402, 449	15
Elect from courses above 202 (excluding 275) to include at least 3 hours at the 500 level	15
Electives in a second foreign language (excluding 275)	6
Sub-Total	36

General Education Distribution Requirements not met by Required Program:

CIS 101-102	2
Area I (include WRI 101-102)	12*
SCI 201 or laboratory science	3
Area II	6
Area III	9
Area IV	12
Area V	3*
Sub-Total	47
Electives	41
Total Semester Hours	124

**Note: A maximum of 3 semester hours of foreign language courses may be applied to Area I and Area V of the Winthrop College General Education Requirements as restricted by the College of Arts and Sciences General Education Requirements.*

The student must attain a cumulative grade-point average of 2.00 or better in courses taken at Winthrop and included in the 36 hours of the required program.

A competency exam on the basic skills is administered to all majors, minors, and any interested students after completion of the intermediate sequence (201, 202, 250). The exam is diagnostic and remedial work, if needed, will be recommended.

Students should enroll for 499 and will be tested individually, after completion of 18 semester hours above 102, no later than the second semester of the junior year, and before enrollment in any 500-level course. Remedial work, if needed, will be recommended. A grade of S is required for graduation.

The student must complete a minimum of 12 semester hours in the major in residence at Winthrop College.

In addition to the 36 semester hours of the required program, the student must select and complete a minor. Within the 124 semester hours required for this degree, the student must also include a minimum of 40 semester hours in courses numbered above 299 and complete PLS 201 or ECO 103 or HIS 211 and 212.

Students desiring certification as teachers of French or Spanish should consult the specific program requirements listed in the next section.

Certification as Secondary School Teacher--B.A. in Modern Languages (French or Spanish Emphasis)

Students desiring certification as teachers of French or Spanish should consult with the department's teacher certification adviser and the Office of Certification, Accreditation, and Educational Research in the School of Education for specific requirements for admission to the Teacher Education Program.

Required Program:	Semester Hours
Either FRE or SPA 201, 202, 250, 401, 402, 449	15
Elect courses from FRE or SPA above 202 to include at least 3 hours at the 500 level	15
Electives in a second foreign	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 10. French Reading and Writing, Level M: High School General Norms—Fourth Year

Reading

Raw Score Form MA	Raw Score Form MB	Converted Score	Percentile Band	Mid-Percentile Rank
49 - 50		198-199	98 -99.9	99.7
47 - 48		196-197	97 -99.9	98
45 - 46	49 - 50	194-195	94 -99.4	98
43 - 44	46 - 47,48	192-193	89 -98	96
41 - 42	44 - 45	190-191	84 -97	92
38 - 39,40	42 - 43	188-189	78 -94	88
36 - 37	39 - 40,41	186-187	73 -89	80
34 - 35	37 - 38	184-185	66 -84	75
32 - 33	35 - 36	182-183	60 -78	70
30 - 31	32 - 33,34	180-181	53 -73	63
28 - 29	30 - 31	178-179	46 -66	56
26 - 27	28 - 29	176-177	40 -60	50
23,24 - 25	25,26 - 27	174-175	33 -53	43
22	23 - 24	172-173	27 -46	33
20 - 21	21 - 22	170-171	18 -40	29
18 - 19	20	168-169	14 -33	23
17	19	166-167	11 -27	18
16	18	164-165	9 -18	14
15	16 - 17	162-163	8 -14	11
14	15	160-161	5 -11	9
13	14	158-159	5 - 9	8
		156-157	4 - 8	5
12	13	154-155	3 - 5	4
11	12	152-153	2 - 5	3
10	10 - 11	150-151	1 - 4	2
8 - 9	9	148-149	1 - 3	2
7	8	146-147	1 - 2	1
6	7	144-145	0.9- 1	1
5	6	142-143	0.9- 1	1
4	5	140-141	0.9- 1	0.9
3	4	138-139	0.9- 0.9	0.9
	3	136-137	0.3- 0.9	0.9
2	2	134-135	0.1- 0.9	0.3
0 - 1	0 - 1	132-133		

Number of Students	331
Number of Schools	46
Mean	177
Standard Deviation	11
Upper Quartile	184
Median	177
Lower Quartile	169
SCAT-V Mean	309
SCAT-V Standard Deviation	13

Writing

Raw Score Form MA	Raw Score Form MB	Converted Score	Percentile Band	Mid-Percentile Rank
100		198-199		
96,97 - 98,99		196-197		
92,93 - 94,95	98,99,100	194-195		
87,88,89 - 90,91	94,95 - 96,97	192-193		
83,84 - 85,86	89,90,91 - 92,93	190-191	98 -99.9	99.4
79,80 - 81,82	85,86 - 87,88	188-189	95 -99.4	98
75,76 - 77,78	80,81,82 - 83,84	186-187	94 -98	95
71,72 - 73,74	76,77 - 78,79	184-185	90 -95	94
67,68 - 69,70	71,72 - 73,74,75	182-183	85 -94	90
63,64 - 65,66	67,68 - 69,70	180-181	77 -90	85
59,60 - 61,62	63,64 - 65,66	178-179	68 -85	77
55,56 - 57,58	58,59 - 60,61,62	176-177	57 -77	68
51,52 - 53,54	54,55 - 56,57	174-175	50 -68	57
47,48 - 49,50	50,51 - 52,53	172-173	43 -57	50
43,44 - 45,46	46,47 - 48,49	170-171	36 -50	43
40,41 - 42	43 - 44,45	168-169	30 -43	36
37,38 - 39	39,40 - 41,42	166-167	25 -36	30
34,35 - 36	36 - 37,38	164-165	21 -30	25
31,32 - 33	33 - 34,35	162-163	16 -25	21
28,29 - 30	30 - 31,32	160-161	9 -21	16
26 - 27	27 - 28,29	158-159	7 -16	9
23 - 24,25	23,24 - 25,26	156-157	6 - 9	7
19,20 - 21,22	20,21 - 22	154-155	5 - 7	6
17 - 18	17 - 18,19	152-153	3 - 6	5
14 - 15,16	14 - 15,16	150-151	2 - 5	3
11,12 - 13	11,12 - 13	148-149	0.6- 3	2
9 - 10	8,9 - 10	146-147	0.6- 2	0.6
6 - 7,8	6 - 7	144-145	0.6- 0.6	0.6
5	4 - 5	142-143	0.6- 0.6	0.6
2,3 - 4	1 - 2,3	140-141	0.6- 0.6	0.6
0,1	0	138-139	0.1- 0.6	0.6

Number of Students	155
Number of Schools	40
Mean	172
Standard Deviation	10
Upper Quartile	179
Median	173
Lower Quartile	165
SCAT-V Mean	310
SCAT-V Standard Deviation	12

TABLE 63. Spanish Reading and Writing, Level M: High School General Norms—Fourth Year

Reading					Writing				
Raw Score		Converted Score	Percentile Band	Mid-Percentile Rank	Raw Score		Converted Score	Percentile Band	Mid-Percentile Rank
Form MA	Form MB				Form MA	Form MB			
	49 - 50	206-207							
	47 - 48	204-205			98,99 - 100		184-185		
	46	202-203	99 -99.9	99.6	93,94 - 95,96,97	96,97,98 - 99,100	182-183		
49 - 50	44 - 45	200-201	97 -99.9	99.3	88,89 - 90,91,92	91,92 - 93,94,95	180-181	99.4-99.9	99.7
47 - 48	42 - 43	198-199	95 -99.6	99	82,83,84 - 85,86,87	85,86,87 - 88,89,90	178-179	98 -99.7	99.4
45 - 46	40 - 41	196-197	93 -99.3	97	77,78,79 - 80,81	80,81,82 - 83,84	176-177	92 -99.4	98
43 - 44	39	194-195	90 -99	95	71,72,73 - 74,75,76	73,74,75 - 76,77,78,79	174-175	79 -98	92
41 - 42	37 - 38	192-193	86 -97	93	65,66 - 67,68,69,70	67,68 - 69,70,71,72	172-173	71 -92	79
39 - 40	35 - 36	190-191	83 -95	90	61,62 - 63,64	63,64 - 65,66	170-171	63 -79	71
37 - 38	33 - 34	188-189	81 -93	86	59 - 60	60 - 61,62	168-169	58 -71	63
35 - 36	31 - 32	186-187	76 -90	83	54,55,56 - 57,58	55,56,57 - 58,59	166-167	51 -63	58
33 - 34	30	184-185	70 -86	81	49,50 - 51,52,53	50,51 - 52,53,54	164-165	42 -58	51
31 - 32	28 - 29	182-183	66 -83	76	45,46 - 47,48	45,46 - 47,48,49	162-163	32 -51	42
29 - 30	26 - 27	180-181	62 -81	70	42 - 43,44	42,43 - 44	160-161	26 -42	32
27 - 28	25	178-179	59 -76	66	38,39 - 40,41	38,39 - 40,41	158-159	20 -32	26
25 - 26	23 - 24	176-177	53 -70	62	34,35 - 36,37	34,35 - 36,37	156-157	12 -26	20
24	22	174-175	49 -66	59	31,32 - 33	30,31,32 - 33	154-155	10 -20	12
22 - 23	21	172-173	43 -62	53	28 - 29,30	27,28 - 29	152-153	8 -12	10
21	19 - 20	170-171	39 -59	49	25 - 26,27	24,25 - 26	150-151	6 -10	8
20	18	168-169	34 -53	43	22,23 - 24	22 - 23	148-149	4 - 8	6
18 - 19	17	166-167	30 -49	39	20 - 21	19 - 20,21	146-147	2 - 6	4
17	16	164-165	25 -43	34	18 - 19	17 - 18	144-145	2 - 4	2
16		162-163	22 -39	30	15,16 - 17	14 - 15,16	142-143	0.6- 2	2
15	15	160-161	18 -34	25	11,12 - 13,14	9,10,11 - 12,13	140-141	0.1- 2	0.6
	14	158-159	16 -30	22	7,8 - 9,10	5,6 - 7,8	138-139		
14	13	156-157	12 -25	18	2,3,4 - 5,6	0,1,2 - 3,4	136-137		
12 - 13	12	154-155	9 -22	16	0,1		134-135		
	11	152-153	6 -18	12					
11	10	150-151	4 -16	9					
9 - 10	9	148-149	3 -12	6					
8		146-147	2 - 9	4					
7	8	144-145	0.7- 6	3					
6	7	142-143	0.7- 4	2					
5	6	140-141	0.4- 3	0.7					
4	5	138-139	0.4- 2	0.7					
3	4	136-137	0.1- 0.7	0.4					
2	3	134-135	0.1- 0.7	0.4					
1	2	132-133							
0	1	130-131							
	0	128-129							

Number of Students	288	Number of Students	168
Number of Schools	34	Number of Schools	30
Mean	174	Mean	165
Standard Deviation	15	Standard Deviation	9
Upper Quartile	183	Upper Quartile	172
Median	171	Median	165
Lower Quartile	160	Lower Quartile	158
SCAT-V Mean	305	SCAT-V Mean	305
SCAT-V Standard Deviation	13	SCAT-V Standard Deviation	13

SPEAKING FLUENCY EXAM

_____

	A. Pronunciation	B. Fluency	C. Structure
1.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
2.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
3.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
4.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
5.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
6.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
7.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
8.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
9.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____
10.	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____	3 _____ 2 _____ 1 _____ 0 _____

Name _____

Score Sheet

Question	Comprehension	Grammar	Vocabulary	Fluency	Accent	TOTAL
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

EXAM SCORE: _____

WEIGHTED EVALUATION: _____

ABSOLUTE SCORE: _____

To score: Divide Exam Score by 250.

Evaluation Criteria

	(1-5) 1	(1-5) 2	(1-5) 3	(1-5) 4	(1-5) 5
COMPREHENSION	No grasp of meaning	Only limited understanding	Question had to be repeated more than once	Question had to be slightly rephrased	Readily understood question
GRAMMAR	Consistent errors	Several major errors	Few major errors	Nothing seriously wrong	One or two insignificant errors
VOCABULARY	Inadequate	Limited to survival level	Choice of words inaccurate but communicative	Adequate and available	Extensive and not repetitious
FLUENCY	Halting - hesitant Long gaps	Lacking continuity	Some hesitations	A few pauses but comfortably consistent	Rarely hesitant
ACCENT	Typically Southern; almost all vowels diphthongized	Southern but not all vowels diphthongized	American but understandable	slightly American	Near-native

250 = 100	225 = 90.0	200 = 80.0	175 = 70.0
249 = 99.6	224 = 89.6	199 = 79.6	174 = 69.6
248 = 99.2	223 = 89.2	198 = 79.2	173 = 69.2
247 = 98.8	222 = 88.8	197 = 78.8	172 = 68.8
246 = 98.4	221 = 88.4	196 = 78.4	171 = 68.4
245 = 98.0	220 = 88.4	195 = 78.0	170 = 68.0
244 = 97.6	219 = 87.6	194 = 77.6	169 = 67.6
243 = 97.2	218 = 87.2	193 = 77.2	168 = 67.2
242 = 96.8	217 = 86.8	192 = 76.8	167 = 66.8
241 = 96.4	216 = 86.4	191 = 76.4	166 = 66.4
240 = 96.0	215 = 86.0	190 = 76.0	165 = 66.0
239 = 95.6	214 = 85.6	189 = 75.6	164 = 65.6
238 = 95.2	213 = 85.2	188 = 75.2	163 = 65.2
237 = 94.8	212 = 84.8	187 = 74.8	162 = 64.8
236 = 94.4	211 = 84.4	186 = 74.4	161 = 64.4
235 = 94.0	210 = 84.0	185 = 74.0	160 = 64.0
234 = 93.6	209 = 83.6	184 = 73.6	159 = 63.6
233 = 93.2	208 = 83.2	183 = 73.2	158 = 63.2
232 = 92.8	207 = 82.8	182 = 72.8	157 = 62.8
231 = 92.4	206 = 82.4	181 = 72.4	156 = 62.4
230 = 92.0	205 = 82.0	180 = 72.0	155 = 62.0
229 = 91.6	204 = 81.6	179 = 71.6	154 = 61.6
228 = 91.2	203 = 81.2	178 = 71.2	153 = 61.2
227 = 90.8	202 = 80.8	177 = 70.8	152 = 60.8
226 = 90.4	201 = 80.4	176 = 70.4	151 = 60.4
			150 = 60.0